

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 08/836,576 | HAENSLER ET AL. |
| | Examiner Zachariah Lucas | Art Unit 1648 |

All Participants:

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Michael Geenfield.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: December 18, 2003

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Obviousness rejections

Claims discussed:

30, 36, 89, 90.

Prior art documents discussed:

Gao and Epanet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner contacted Applicant to discuss most recent claim amendments. Claim amendments and arguments in traversal of the outstanding rejections were discussed.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

JAMES HOUSEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600


James C. Housel
[Signature]
[Signature]
Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)